

Meeting Minutes

MEETING DATE: September 27, 2006

TO: Runway 27 Advisory Committee (RWY 27 AC)

FROM: Steve Kelly, FAA, Eastern Terminal Services

Meeting Purpose: To review and discuss FAA's Runway 27 flight track operations and monitoring efforts required in the 1996 Record of Decision (ROD).

Attendees: FAA – Steve Kelley, Gary Hufnagle, Joe Bellabona, Mark Lesko, Jon T. Harris; **Massport** – Flavio Leo,; Runway **27 AC** – Anastasia Lyman, John Stewart Bob D'Amico, Ann Hershfang, Dovi Abbey, **Non Runway 27 AC Individuals/Representatives** – Senator Kerry's Office - Mark Sternman, Joseph Lombardo, Christina Des Vaux; Senator Wilkerson's Office - Richard Giordano - Liz Malia's Office – Jacob Glickel; Boston City Council – Louis A Elisa; South end News – Chris Orchard; Interested party – Jacques Weissgerber

Meeting Summary: (also see 09/27/06 meeting agenda w handouts)

Steve reviewed minutes from the 09/29/2005 meeting and reiterated that should subject matter relative to changing RWY 27 operations or procedures surface, an active Community Action Committee (CAC) Airside Study is underway and will address those issues. Steve proposed that instead of regular meetings, perhaps a web site or some other method could be used that would satisfy the RWY 27 ROD requirements.

Mr. John Stewart disagreed with that proposal and requested FAA continue meeting at least every nine months as required in the 1996 Environmental Impact Study (EIS) ROD. He stated that the work the CAC airside study is undertaking, may take years to complete and that this group should continue meetings and review, analyze and redesign the procedure or the operations to be in compliance with the RWY 27 EIS ROD. Steve indicated the discussion was beneficial and future meeting needs and ROD compliance issues are agenda issues, however, to stay on track, the group needed to get to the ATA Lab analysis.

Mark Lesco from ATA Lab /CNA Corporation provided handouts of the Massport Track Analysis and the ATA Lab Analysis of Boston (BOS) Logan RWY 27 Jet Departures.

Mark continued by conducting a thorough presentation about what the analysis revealed, such as identifying RWY 27 departure corridor deviations, and trends among flights that did or did not remain within the corridor. He went into to meticulous detail in explaining

Boston Logan Runway 27 Advisory Committee Meeting
September 27, 2006
DRAFT

the data to include; aircraft positions using latitude/longitude and altitude from radar hits, and then progressively followed which then display the aircraft's flight track.

John Stewart asked, "how does Mark know the ground map is accurate with respect to the display of the radar hits relative to an aircraft's actual position over the ground?" Flavio Leo then suggested that FAA put into the minutes a statement that confirms there is a process to verify radar maps are accurately aligned. A brief explanation then ensued on how the maps are continuously validated. The group moved onto the analysis presentation, so it could be completed within the allotted time.

At the conclusion of Mark's presentation, the group stated how much they appreciated the quality of work present in the analysis. Mark's work was exactly what they needed to take action to improve corridor compliance. An immediate recommendation from Anastasia, backed by John Stewart, was to move the 2.2 DME, turn point and the GARVEY Way Point closer to the RWY to capture more aircraft through gate A & B. Joe Bellabona explained to the group that moving the waypoint of DME closer to the RWY will not resolve the issue of gate A & B capture. This option had been previously field tested with North West Airlines simulation trials. The flight simulations determined that moving the fix closer to the RWY, did not allow sufficient time for pilot reaction, and subsequent FMS capture and engagement of autopilot, so there was no gain in compliance. Joe Bellabona stated that current United States Standard for Terminal Instrument Procedures (TERPS) departure procedure criteria would prevent FAA from moving the fix to 2 DME. Flavio recommended that we obtain and review the data obtained from North West Airlines.

The following observations were also identified: Aircraft type seemed to be the best method of reviewing the data and taking action to improve corridor compliance. Both the MD88 and B 752/7 were the worst offenders for gate A and B compliance whereas regional jets in general were more successful with making all the gates. Joe recommended to Mark that adding an equipment qualifier to the aircraft type would further help the analysis to reflect how a flight crew operates that aircraft and in turn make user recommendations to improve track compliance. Anastasia indicated that we need to not only readdress crew training but perhaps move the waypoint for better track compliance. Steve indicated that he did not think moving the waypoint would work and that it would not be allowed under current criteria. Joe concurred with that response. Someone in the group indicated that perhaps we need the FAA to make the recommendations to us the "RWY 27 Advisory Committee".

The new Roslindale participant indicated he thought the issue is not statistics and aircraft compliance, its noise and the impacts noise has on the communities below. John Stewart indicated that this corridor was designed to impact the least amount of people and fanning would only increase the impact on more of the population. It was also pointed out that linking this process to noise was not within the scope of the RWY 27 ROD.

Boston Logan Runway 27 Advisory Committee Meeting
September 27, 2006
DRAFT

Meeting Adjourned: 12:45 pm, next meeting schedule for Thursday, March 8, 2007, at 930 am.

Action Items: Steve Kelly:

- Review the current analysis and develop an overall strategy recommendation to the RWY 27 Advisory Committee.
- Look at adjusting the departure procedure fix, what are the impacts on RWY 27 corridor compliance?
- Contact the airlines with the like aircraft that have both good and bad compliance to determine why one does type perform better than the other, and then make recommendations to the airlines for compliance.
- Set-up a web site for intermediate reports and documentation record keeping, provide between meeting status reports either by email or on the new web site.
- Add a technical glossary to the ATA Lab analysis report. (E.g. what is MD-88 B752, RADAR, etc)?
- Have the ATA Lab complete another 6 month analysis beginning at future some point in time.